Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 12851-US-PA
Application No.: 10/710,346

## REMARKS

**Present Status of the Application**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding nonfinal Office Action mailed January 19, 2007. The Office Action has rejected claims 1-5, 7-10, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 (b) as being clearly anticipated by Masuda (US 5,012,228; hereinafter "Masuda"). Further, the Office Action has rejected claim 6 under U.S.C. Section 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Masuda in view of the applicant's admitted prior art ("AAPA" hereinafter). In addition, the Office Action has also rejected claims 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Masuda.

After carefully considering the remarks set forth in this Office Action and the cited references, Applicants respectfully submitted that the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection are requested.

**Discussion of the 35 U.S.C § 102 Rejections**

*The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 7-10, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Masuda (US 5,012,228).*

As described hereinafter, Applicants respectfully submit that Masuda is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claims 1 and 7 because Masuda fails to disclose each element of the claims under consideration.

Independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that Masuda does not disclose, teach, or suggest the features that are highlighted in claim 1. More specifically, the present invention teaches in claim 1, among other things, connecting each pixel that has K=I x J sub-pixels to I scan lines and J data lines. For example, if

I=2 and J=1.5, each pixel in the present invention has 3 sub-pixels and connects to 2 scan lines and 1.5 data lines. Masuda, on the other hand, teaches connecting each pixel (i.e. pixel array block in Col. 3 lines 4-7 of Masuda) that has **K** x **n** sub-pixels (i.e. display elements in Col. 3 lines 4-7 of Masuda) to **K+1** scan lines (i.e. scanning lines in Col. 3 lines 8-9 of Masuda) and **n** +1 data lines (i.e. data lines in Col. 3 lines 13-14 of Masuda). For example, if K=2 and n=1.5, each pixel in Masuda has 3 sub-pixels and connects to 3 scan lines and 2.5 data lines. Thus, Masuda does not anticipate claim 1, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

If independent claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record, then its dependent claims 2-5 are allowable as a matter of law because these dependent claims contain all features of their respective independent claim 1. *In re Fine*. 837, F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claim 7, among other things, discloses a step of "scanning I x N scan lines in said display area in sequence". Masuda, on the other hand, teaches scanning K+1 scan lines by utilizing "skip scan" (Masuda, Fig. 4, and Col. 4, line 62 - Col. 5 line 39). For example, in the odd-numbered frame, Masuda scans scanning scan lines according to the following sequence : the $2^{nd}$, $1^{st}$ , $5^{th}$, $4^{th}$..... scan lines (i.e. G1, G2, G4, G5..... in FIG.3), and in the even-numbered frame, Masuda scans lines according to the following sequence : the $2^{nd}$, $3^{rd}$ , $5^{th}$, $6^{th}$..... scan lines (i.e. G1, G3, G4, G6..... in FIG.3). Thus, Masuda does not anticipate claim 7, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

If independent claim 7 is allowable over the prior art of record, then its dependent claims 8-10, and 13 are allowable as a matter of law because these dependent

claims contain all features of their independent claim 7. *In re Fine*. 837, F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

**Discussion of the 35 U.S.C § 103 Rejections**

*The Office Action rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masuda (US 5,012,228), in view of the applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA). The Office Action also rejected claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masuda (US 5,012,228).*

The liquid crystal display projector of claim 6 comprises the liquid crystal panel of claim 1. Since claim 1 is patentable based on at least the reasons above, it is submitted that claim 6 is patentable. Hence the rejection to claim 6 should be withdrawn.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 7 patently defines over the prior art references. Since claims 11 and 12 are dependent claims which further define the invention recited in claim 7, as a matter of law these dependent claims are also in condition for allowance. *In re Fine*, 837, F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectively requested.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 12851-US-PA
Application No.: 10/710,346

## CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the presently pending claims 1-13 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date : April 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee
Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw